	Toomaks	
1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORKx	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
4	V •	17 Cr. 350 (KBF)
5	LEVAN MAKASHVILI,	
6 7	Defendant.	Sentence
8	x	
9		New York, N.Y. August 24, 2018 12:30 p.m.
LO		-
.1	Before:	
.2	HON. KATHERINE B. FORREST,	
.3		District Judge
4	APPEARANCES	
.5	GEOFFREY S. BERMAN United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York ANDREW M. THOMAS	
.7	ANDREW ADAMS Assistant United States Attorneys	
.8	XAVIER R. DONALDSON Attorney for Defendant	
20	ALSO PRESENT: LASHA GEGECHKORI, Interpreter (Georgian)	
1		
2		
:3		
4		
:5		

I80HMakS

(Case called)

MR. THOMAS: Good afternoon. Andrew Thomas and Andrew Adams, for the United States.

THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon, both of you.

MR. DONALDSON: Your Honor, Xavier R. Donaldson, for Mr. Makashvili. Good afternoon.

Good afternoon, government.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Donaldson.

The Court notes Mr. Makashvili is here and present. Good afternoon, sir.

All right. I see that the defendant is wearing the equipment that allows him to hear the interpreter. If at any point in time you cannot hear the interpretation, just let me know or let Mr. Donaldson know, but if you don't say anything that indicates that you don't hear, we'll assume that you're able to hear everything. All right?

THE DEFENDANT: (In English) Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

I apologize for keeping you folks waiting. We had a little miscommunication in chambers about whether this was going to be at 1:00 or at noon. I was downstairs, not knowing I should have been upstairs. So it's my fault, and so I apologize for that.

Let me start by setting forth for you folks the materials that we have in connection with this proceeding, and

we'll take it from there.

The crime of conviction is traveling in interstate and foreign commerce with the intent to promote, manage, establish, carry on, and facilitate a business enterprise involving gambling. And there is a maximum five-year term of imprisonment that could be imposed on any individual convicted of that crime.

I've received in connection with this proceeding also a defense submission that is dated August 19, 2018. It was filed the next day, but is signed August 19.

I have also received in connection with this proceeding a presentence investigation report that is revised as of July 25, 2018.

And then separately and what gave rise, in part, to my order of yesterday was I received on August 21 from Pretrial Services notification that the defendant has violated the terms of his bail, at least purportedly, and had been arrested on July -- I'm sorry, August 12, and then notified -- he notified pretrial the next day on August 13 that he'd been arrested. As I understand it, the arrest was for a couple of things. But in part, he was stopped for a traffic violation, and it turned out he was both driving with a suspended license and also there was a stolen, or at least purportedly stolen, license plate on the vehicle he was in. I don't take the report as indicating that the vehicle was stolen but that the plate was stolen. So I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have this report also.

As I understand it, based upon an email to chambers, I believe everybody has received a copy of this report. If people have not, then I'm happy to hand around the copy that I have. Otherwise, I'll assume you're all aware of it.

I have not received in connection with this sentencing any submission from the government, and so I wanted to first confirm, Mr. Thomas, that's correct?

MR. THOMAS: That's correct, your Honor. Yesterday the government filed a letter indicating that it would not be filing a formal submission in this case.

THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else that you folks think I should have?

MR. DONALDSON: No, your Honor.

Yes, we did receive the Pretrial Services memorandum, I believe the same time the Court did. I think I did.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. DONALDSON: 22nd -- 23rd.

THE COURT: All right. So we've all got, then, the same set of materials.

MR. DONALDSON: Yes

THE COURT: Mr. Donaldson, have you had an opportunity to review the PSR with your client?

MR. DONALDSON: Yes, I have, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you or your client have any objections

to or modifications that need to be made to the PSR?

MR. DONALDSON: None except we did -- and I spoke to the government about this again this morning -- in our submission to the Court, we did put regarding the security aspect of the allegation itself, I believe the report says he acted as muscle, or something to that effect. Again, I haven't talked to the government about this for quite some time over the last year or 14 months. We didn't like the word "muscle," that he was portrayed as being the muscle or one of the muscle for Mr. Shulaya, so I just wanted to make that kind of passive, call it passive, objection.

We do note and acknowledge, as I told the government, that he was present on several occasions when Mr. Shulaya was with who we knew to be muscle. We do know that he was there on some of those occasions. I just did not have any information whatsoever that he participated or, for lack of a better term, flexed to anybody that he was here to protect Shulaya or anything like that.

So I just wanted to note that as passively as possible. I just didn't have that specific information.

THE COURT: Let me just ask, is there anything you would like -- I hear the point. I think that the evidence at the Shulaya trial appeared to indicate that there were individuals often who were associated either with the fighting community or MMA who would be present with Shulaya and that it

may be that the individual, Mr. Makashvili, was not himself
intending to provide muscle, but that there was a presence of
these individuals with this particular skill set in the

MR. DONALDSON: Right.

vicinity of Mr. Shulaya.

THE COURT: I think that is really the purpose for which it's being used. There's no indication in the materials before me that Mr. Makashvili committed or perpetrated any violence.

MR. DONALDSON: Right. I did read the trial, the 2,000 or so pages that were a very entertaining trial. I might add I did read that just to make sure that didn't happen. So I agree with the Court. That's, I think, how it was.

THE COURT: So do you want me to take the phrase "as muscle" out?

MR. DONALDSON: Yes, I'd prefer that.

THE COURT: Mr. Thomas, does the government have any objection to that?

MR. THOMAS: As we communicated to Mr. Donaldson, we don't have an objection to rewording or omitting that particular word. I think the point which the Court has already taken is that Mr. Makashvili formed part of an entourage of fighters that Mr. Shulaya used to signal his status and capacity for physical retaliation. The government makes no allegation that Mr. Makashvili committed any acts of violence

or was, in fact, used in the way in which Mr. Donaldson, I think, is concerned. But I think the government's position, and that is reflected by the trial evidence, is that Mr. Makashvili was one of many who performed a signaling function.

THE COURT: Why don't we see if this works.

Paragraph 9 would be changed to say, "Levan Makashvilli is a professional MMA fighter and served the Shulaya enterprise," insert "as part of Mr. Shulaya's entourage, and as a driver," and strike the phrase "as muscle and." So the word "muscle" was out. He was just there and present.

MR. DONALDSON: I'll take that, your Honor. Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Thomas, is that acceptable to you?

MR. THOMAS: It is, your Honor.

THE COURT: So that will be a change, Chris, which needs to be noted on a blue card in the PSR for paragraph 9, and so then probation would then prepare a revised PSR that would then go onto the docket reflecting the blue card. All right.

Other than that, Mr. Donaldson, do you have any changes or modifications to the factual statements in the PSR?

MR. DONALDSON: I do not, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does your client have any additional changes or modifications to the factual statements in the PSR?

MR. DONALDSON: After speaking to him again yesterday,

he does not.

THE COURT: Mr. Thomas, does the government have any additional -- any changes or modifications to the PSR?

MR. THOMAS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: The Court then does adopt the factual statements in the PSR. The PSR will be made part of the record in this matter and filed under seal. If an appeal is taken, then counsel on any appeal may have access to the PSR without any need for further application to the Court.

Let's turn to the guidelines. The guidelines in the PSR are reflected as an offense level of eight and a criminal history category of I. That is the same as the offense level and criminal history category that the parties indicated in the plea agreement. And based upon the information currently available to me, that appears to be the correct calculation.

Does anyone have any comment on the guidelines? Otherwise, I'll confirm them as eight and I.

MR. THOMAS: No comment, your Honor.

MR. DONALDSON: No comment, your Honor.

THE COURT: So the guidelines are offense level eight, criminal history category as ${\tt I.}$

OK, folks. Let's turn to the next portion of the proceeding, and let me just introduce this very briefly with a little bit of a further explanation to my order of yesterday which indicated that I was considering an incarceratory

sentence. Let me tell you why.

I am very concerned about the recent arrest of the defendant, and it appears to indicate to me, particularly since this was the period of time while he was just weeks away from sentencing in this matter and after a serious trial that had already occurred with codefendants and all of the information that had become known, that that series of events appeared to indicate a lack of appreciation for the seriousness of the conduct and a need, frankly, for a sentence that indicated that the Court took things seriously and that there was a need for personal deterrence and that a probationary sentence did not appear to achieve that, given the fact that the defendant's driving around in a vehicle with stolen plates, with a suspended license two weeks before he's to be sentenced for a felony. So that is why I issued the order that I did, and so you folks should fold that into your comments.

But from my perspective, it is a 3553(a) consideration. Obviously, the conduct, he's not being sentenced for that other state conduct. It's just a 3553(a) consideration in terms of the need for personal deterrence and, really, his personal characteristics. So fold that into whatever you'd like to say, but that gives you a little bit more information about why the order that was issued, issued.

Mr. Thomas, with that said, why don't you go ahead and proceed, sir.

MR. THOMAS: Yes, your Honor. I'll start first by focusing on the defendant's conduct in the charged case. It's the government's perspective that a sentence within the zero to six-month range would be appropriate in terms of imprisonment.

Mr. Makashvili at the time the case was taken down and the arrest occurred and some initial presentations were made to the Court was thought to have been all over a number of telephones with communications, most notably, to Mr. Shulaya talking about a range of criminal conduct. In the course of the investigation that followed even the takedown, what we discovered is that we had been — we had mistaken that all of those phones were Mr. Makashvili's himself. It was, in fact, the case that Mr. Makashvili had used his name for a number of telephones that were distributed to a number of fighters, and so only a portion of the conversations that we had intercepted were Mr. Makashvili, although the sort of registration information on a number of those telephones came back to him.

That led us to sort of recontextualize Mr. Makashvili in that where we end up is that Mr. Makashvili really is a minor person who supports the Shulaya enterprise. He supported it by providing those telephones. He supported it, as he explained in his factual allocution, by driving Mr. Shulaya around, knowing that the purpose of the drives was to enable Mr. Shulaya to attend to the gambling business and then most notably, as was focused at the trial, by accompanying Shulaya

and others when he travels west to LA to meet with the LA four, and it's out in LA that Mr. Makashvili is standing shoulder to shoulder with Shulaya as part of the entourage to signal that Mr. Shulaya, from the East Coast, you know, he's an important person and to be respected on the West Coast in this conversation with Mr. Kazarian.

So from the Court's perspective, perhaps one of the things to focus on at sentencing is not so much the specific acts individually that Mr. Makashvili has undertaken, but rather that he formed part, again, of this enterprise and signaled that it was something desirable, that it had form and force, and that Mr. Shulaya was somebody to be respected and feared. So from the government's perspective, there is at least a particular general deterrence value.

THE COURT: Let me just ask you, in terms of that, what is the period of time that you understand Mr. Makashvili functioned as a driver and/or was part of the entourage? And I ask that in part because -- and you can tell part of that information from the phones and everything else -- but I want to get a sense as to whether there were only two instances of him driving Mr. Shulaya around or whether it was expected that that there were a number.

MR. THOMAS: One moment, your Honor.

(Counsel confer)

MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, the agents may come forward

and correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe that Mr. Makashvili is at least spotted and observed starting at the end of 2016. He has international travel during the spring of 2017 that removes him from the day-to-day operations, and then he returns and rejoins the Shulaya enterprise when it heads to California.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. THOMAS: It extended over a period of months with a break in which he's overseas.

THE COURT: I would say, as you folks know from paragraph 9 of the PSR, he's present at least as of May 2016, not just the end of 2016.

MR. THOMAS: That's right, your Honor.

THE COURT: So it was sometime during 2016, 2017 with a break where Mr. Makashvili was traveling internationally.

MR. THOMAS: That's correct.

THE COURT: Then he was arrested in June of 2017.

Anything else, Mr. Thomas?

MR. THOMAS: Yes. I wanted to comment, if I could, about the report from Pretrial Services. Since that report came through, the government has been looking into the circumstances. And part of the reason why we haven't focused on that in our sentencing submission or in our remarks now is that we don't fully yet have context as to what exactly happened.

We could tell the Court and I know Mr. Donaldson has

an explanation as for why Mr. Makashvili happened to be driving that day, but the plate was stolen. The vehicle appears to be Mr. Makashvili's vehicle or vehicle that he uses. What we have learned is that that plate, it appears, was stolen from a rental car company or off a rental car in Florida a few years back. Since the time it was stolen, the plate has been in New York City for a while and used on a series of vehicles, but it has only been used on the vehicle Mr. Makashvili was stopped in since July.

So I don't know. We don't have an answer yet as to whether Mr. Makashvili switched out the plates after his license was suspended or whether there was some other more nefarious purpose for switching plates on that vehicle, but it appears that that stolen plate has been around New York City, it's been on a series of vehicles, and only recently ended up on Mr. Makashvili's vehicle. That's the point where we arrived in our investigation.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: Oh, I'm sorry. Normally, I'll come over here, so I'll come over here.

I'll try to be brief, your Honor. I tried to explain a little bit in my sentencing submission that I would go backwards starting with the recent, what I gather from the Court and I understand from the Court's writing last night, is a very serious matter.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I agree that any arrest is a serious matter. I agree with that. And I do still do a lot of state court work, so I appreciate the Court's attention to it. I somewhat disagree with whether or not it's of the manner or to the level that would require going from probation, a probationary consideration, to jail. I'll go to my reasons why, but I think I'm landing in that lane.

The reason is he was, in fact, stopped on August 12, 2018. He did report it to probation, to his officer, the very next day when he could. So I think that is good on his part. We should put in context why he was stopped, though. I understand, he was in Brooklyn, and he was going to take his mother-in-law her medication. She had just fainted, and so she needed medication. So he did tell me he was trying to get there. He was trying to get there because his mother had just fallen and banged her head. She's elderly. He was trying to get her medication, so he did that. He did, in fact, get the officers the medication. They did, in fact, rush it over to the mother-in-law because she was in need of it. That's why he was stopped. I don't know if he said he ran a stop sign, but he did acknowledge he was rushing to get there. He did then at that point find out his license was suspended.

Now, to that point, licenses, as the Court may know and I'm sure the prosecutors know, in New York City, the way licenses are suspended is that you get a summons; and then if

you don't answer the summons, they send you a suspension letter to an address or to someplace, and that's their notice that you are suspended. Now, we've been arguing about that in New York State court for quite some time about that should not be the proper notice because sometimes people just don't get their mail, or whatever. So I don't believe and Mr. Makashvili has informed me that he did not know his license was suspended, which is why as soon as he found out, he got it reinstated the next day or two days later on the 16th, three days later on the 16th. So it's for, I believe, one summons. From what I understand, one summons that was issued.

I told the prosecutors that normally when I have that situation regarding that or a suspended licenses, I look back to find out whether or not the person has been stopped or something in between that, because then I would say, well, if he knew his license was suspended and you stopped him before, they would have given him the suspended license then. In this situation I asked the government, well, I didn't know when the license plate supposedly got on the car because he got the summons, and if he got a summons, if he didn't get arrested for driving with a stolen plate, then that creates a conflict, in my mind, because if he got a summons, that must mean some police officers had to have seen the license plate. I don't know when he got the summons. I thought it was sometime in June. I need to check that out.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The government has now told me, based upon their investigation, and told the Court that the license plate was stolen from Florida, or wherever it was stolen from, a year and a half ago. So we know Mr. Makashvili didn't steal a license That's not the case. We know that. The question is whether or not he knew he had a stolen license plate on his vehicle. I don't believe he knew that either. I say that because I've seen him drive the vehicle, and like I told the government, unless he's plumb crazy to have a federal case and drive his vehicle up to the federal courthouse knowing he has a stolen plate on it. That would be kind of silly. And I think common sense dictates that that means, in my mind, he didn't know it was stolen. Not saying that it wasn't stolen, not saying he shouldn't have had it on there. I grant all that. But when I think about what the Court said, whether or not he's not taking the Court seriously, taking this case seriously enough to get arrested prior to -- two weeks prior to sentencing, I just don't think, in my mind, that he knew -- no one knows they're going to be arrested; two, I don't know that he knew his license was suspended, nor do I think he knew he had a stolen license plate.

So, in my opinion, I'm hoping that the Court doesn't believe that he was driving around with that knowledge two weeks before sentencing because he didn't care about that.

That's not the case. I just don't think he knew about those

issues, and that's why it got resolved so quickly.

THE COURT: Why would he have taken his license plate off of his vehicle if he didn't know that his license had been suspended? In other words, we know that there was a plate on his vehicle that was there when his license was suspended. We know that there is another plate on the vehicle within two months.

MR. DONALDSON: Well, license plates --

THE COURT: People don't walk around swapping out their plates --

MR. DONALDSON: I agree.

THE COURT: -- every day.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ DONALDSON: I agree with that to a point. I mean, we can have --

THE COURT: Most people.

MR. DONALDSON: We can have a discussion about this probably off the record so I won't get myself in trouble. But, yeah, I don't know if that's exactly true, Judge, with all due respect. Secondly, license plates and suspended license don't go hand in hand. You don't take off the license plate to prevent yourself from getting -- you don't put a stolen license plate on a car to prevent the police department from knowing that you have a suspended license.

THE COURT: No, I agree with that, but I'll --

MR. DONALDSON: That would not make any sense. I

don't think he swapped the license plate out so that the police department wouldn't know he has a suspended license. That would make -- that just would be nonsensical.

THE COURT: Let's put it this way: There are circumstances under which this gentleman put a license plate that did not belong to him, and presumably since it was a license plate from a rental car company in Florida, that it had an uncertain provenance that he put onto a vehicle that he drove.

MR. DONALDSON: I think I will agree with the -- we have to make some assumptions. I'm going to just assume for record purposes that he put the license plate on there. I'm going to assume for record purposes that -- well, it was a Florida plate, but I just cannot and I cannot make the leap that he put, knowingly put, a stolen license plate on his car and drove around. We just don't, in my experience, hold out knowingly stolen goods. Normally when you know something is stolen, it's something that you can secret.

THE COURT: You normally don't put somebody else's -- this is a Florida plate.

MR. DONALDSON: I agree with that.

THE COURT: It's not like a New York plate.

MR. DONALDSON: I'm not disagreeing with that part. I think the part about putting a Florida plate on your car is outright stupid, with all due respect to my client, but I just

don't and I'm not and I can't based, on my conversations with him and with his manager, who is his wife, go so far as saying that he knew that the car — that the plate was stolen. I think that's where we separate. I do think he made a colossal, colossally — is that a good word? That's a bad word — a very large, dumb decision regarding putting a license plate on his car. I do not think he put the license plate on the car knowing that the license plate was stolen. That part I know he didn't do. So that's that.

But to that point, and I don't know that he did that, saying that -- I don't know. I'm sure he didn't do that saying that he doesn't appreciate the seriousness of the case. For the last 14 months, he's expressed to me the seriousness of the case and how much trouble he's in, and he's looking at jail time and the Court can sentence anywhere from zero to five, at that point zero to 20 years. I don't want the Court to believe or to think for one second --

THE COURT: Zero to five years.

MR. DONALDSON: Well, what I'm saying is, no, before we negotiated this great plea, before that it was much more than that.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. DONALDSON: So he appreciated the seriousness of the case for quite some time. He appreciated the seriousness of the case after we took the plea. At that point, he's been

appreciating it since that time. We talk a lot. So I cannot emphasize the fact that he does appreciate how serious the matter is and in no uncertain terms because of the consequences that follow from it and what can happen to him related to his personal and professional experience. Unlike, I think, anyone else, you know, he — when I say he has been actively and begging me almost every week how he could get back fighting, because that's all he knows, and he knows that this is going to play a large part in doing that. So that's why I'm saying I cannot imagine he would be doing anything that would intentionally try to mess that up. That just is the farthest thing from his mind.

So this, what happened the last two weeks, I don't think was because he has no respect for the process or he doesn't know how serious it is, but I think it's more one of, maybe even before that, several pretty poor decisions, not anything criminal in mind, but just a significantly poor decision that I don't think should result in a consideration from probation for jail time.

As far as the 3553 factors, I agree it does go towards that. The Court should use all that it should regarding Mr. Makashvili's character, etc., regarding the sentence, but I think to that end, 3553 and its analysis weighs heavily, I mean, I think very heavily towards a non-incarceratory sentence. If I could have an opportunity, I'll just say

briefly why.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I looked at the PSR pretty carefully, and what I was struck by was page 23 where it talks about voluntary surrender. One of the things that I like noting is what other people think and, of course, the courts think about why people should get sentenced. Here, the last sentence where it states that Mr. Makashvili is not viewed as a flight risk or a danger to the community, why is that important? It's important because the probation department believes, of course that he's not a flight risk, but more importantly they believe he's not a danger to the community. Why is that important to me? Because I firmly believe that jail, prison, any type of custodial process should be reserved for those persons that are, in fact, somehow dangerous to the community or could be or was or committed some act that we believe, as a society, he should be taken from society for a while. Mr. Makashvili simply does not present that in any way, shape, or form.

I also would like to, if I can, look at page 20 of the PSR. Page 20 where the probation department indicates, and I'll read for the record: "Based upon Mr. Makashvili's first-time offender status and minor role in the offense, we view a custodial sentence as unnecessary and believe a sentence of probation sufficiently addresses the sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. 3553, most significantly, just punishment."

I agree wholeheartedly with that. Why do I agree

wholeheartedly with that? For the reasons set forth in my sentencing memorandum. One second.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

For example, as indicated, Mr. Makashvili was not a leader, organizer, supervisor, or manager of this conspiracy. He was considered a minor participant. He is not alleged to have committed any violence related to or in furtherance of this federal conduct. This was his first contact of any kind with law enforcement. He does not have a significant role in this conspiracy. He has maintained gainful employment, significantly provides for his two children, has family support and community support. Outside this criminal conduct, he's maintained a structured, productive life. Why do I say structured, productive? Because as we know and as the Court knows doing a lot of sentencing proceedings, we look to that to find out whether or not there's going to be some kind of recidivism. If the person does not have a structured, productive life, normally they go out and do other things. this situation, he is a very structured, productive, disciplined person, unlike probably many other people I've seen.

He did not earn any significant income for his criminal conduct. Of course, that's not an element, that's not what the government has to prove, but it is something that courts look at. For example, if he had earned \$500,000 or \$100,000, or whatever the case may be, then we would be saying,

well, he earned this amount of money, so we know he profited, and therefore, that goes towards sentence. He didn't do that here, and that's not the case. Quite frankly, he didn't earn a penny, from what I understand.

Mr. Makashvili has already lost significant economic opportunity and future earnings as a result of this criminal conduct. Why is that important? When he first got arrested last year in June, I believe in August he was scheduled or September he was scheduled for a world championship fight in Georgia or Russia, I believe, where that fight would have catapulted him to the world championship fight. Of course, because of his conduct, I'm not saying anyone else, because of his conduct, he was not able to do that. Subsequent to that, several other contracts came through for Mr. Makashvili from the fight and other fights where he could have continued his ascension up the ranks. Couldn't do those either.

So I think the Court talked about this when we tried to get -- ask him to be allowed to travel. It was important to note that fighters, athletes, have shelf lives. I know that. I was a former athlete. We got shelf lives. Got to take the opportunity when it comes because if it doesn't, you will miss it. His shelf life is about over, almost over. So he's missed out on three or four championship-caliber fights. I believe he's scheduled for another one in October, this October, of course if he's out and can travel. So he has given up a lot,

and he has been punished a lot. So we must look at every defendant individually about how they are and how the crime impacts them individually. In this individual's situation, his collateral consequences are significant.

We talked about and the Court noted how long he was involved, May 2016, but it was intermittent, as I like to say, May 2016, again a little later than that, then not too much and then again at the end part of it. That's important, I think, because it wasn't a consistent strand or continuity of involvement.

Finally, it's important to note that Mr. Makashvili is subject to deportation. That's probably one of the most important aspects of it. You know, it is a zero to five maximum. Normally, I'm saying normally, deportation may not happen, but it may. He has been advised that it may very well happen because of the circumstances and the atmosphere that we're in right now. He may very well be deported. He's aware of that. He was aware of that before he took the plea, so that's important as well.

So for those reasons, we sincerely believe that he is not a danger to the community. He is not someone that I believe should be sentenced to incarceration, notwithstanding this last hiccup, whether or not this lack most recent contact elevates him from probation to, say, I don't know, house arrest plus probation, I don't know, but I really do not believe that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

all criminal conduct should result in jail. I just don't believe that. I don't believe that every person that's convicted of a crime should go to jail. I don't believe that. I don't believe Congress believes that. I don't believe that certain state legislators believe that. In fact, since Congress said zero to five, that must mean that there is a circumstance where a person that's charged and convicted of this particular crime, Congress believes that they can get zero. I can't imagine how a person like Mr. Makashvili, who's a first offender, nonviolent, minor participant, working, structured, family man, focused, disciplined, etc., is not the type of person that Congress thought, when convicted of this crime, can't get zero. I don't know what other factor that would be used to promote a zero other than that.

So for those reasons, I think that Mr. Makashvili is a prime candidate for a non-incarceratory sentence. I agree that the recent contact with law enforcement should cause us pause. I agree that Mr. Makashvili should resolve that matter and should receive, I guess, something more than saying don't do it, but I do not believe it should warrant any type of incarceration. The guidelines is zero to six months. A probationary term falls squarely within that, and I think that's the appropriate and just sentence for Mr. Makashvili.

If the Court has any questions for me -- oh, last thing. Your Honor doesn't know this, but I do quote your Honor

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

quite often in my sentencing submissions, and you said to me one time a long time ago in a case that a client was facing prison time, and I believe the words were: Mr. Donaldson, sometimes a person would rather have some jail time than face the collateral consequences of having a felony conviction. They would rather trade that sometimes, and I agree with that. Sometimes if I can have -- if it was up to me and I had the choice between taking a two, three months in jail or having a lifelong stigma of a felony conviction where I can't do anything with it, I might take that jail rather than those collateral consequences. In this situation, it might be the I can't imagine how jail for Mr. Makashvili would serve any purpose, any purpose at all, except that it would fill a jail cell for a little while and, two, it will prevent him from securing that possible championship belt that will provide some kind of economic resource for his family for the rest of their life. Other than that, respectfully, I don't know what a jail sentence would do.

Personal deterrence, the collateral consequences that he's faced and will continue to face, I think, will serve as a significant personal deterrence, in my humble opinion.

With that, I'll stand down. If the Court has any questions, I'll be happy to answer them.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Donaldson. I don't have any additional questions at the moment.

Mr. Makashvili, would you like to address the Court before sentence is imposed?

THE DEFENDANT: (In English) I want to just say sorry.

THE COURT: OK. Thank you. Thank you.

Anything else that you would like to say? There's no obligation to speak. I just invite you to speak. You're always entitled to speak and have a right to speak.

THE DEFENDANT: (In English) I want to say something.

I love this country. When I left my -- I don't know. I want to say sorry, you know.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Thank you.

Let me describe how I reach a sentencing determination. Here, even though this particular crime does not carry high guidelines, I am required to reference the guidelines in any event, and I have reviewed the guidelines here and am mindful of them.

The guidelines here for an offense level of eight and a criminal history category of I are zero to six months. I note that in particular because there is an error in the probation report where there's an indication on page 19 that the guidelines are zero to eight months, and they're not. They are zero to six months, and that's on page 19. The guidelines are correctly referenced in the plea agreement, and I think we have all been assuming and working along the lines of a guidelines range of zero to six months.

In all events, the guidelines are advisory only. What I have to do for every individual is to determine whether the guidelines suggest a reasonable range and also as part of my review of the guidelines to look at different ways in which sentences may be structured and to be certain that I've taken into consideration all of the various possibilities of types of sentences that could achieve the various sentencing purposes set forth in 3553(a).

For every defendant, including you, Mr. Makashvili, what the Court does is the Court tries to determine and seeks to determine what is a sufficient, but not greater than necessary, sentence for you for the crime of conviction. Here, the crime of conviction is a crime which is, in large part, about being a facilitator of others, here through driving and/or accompanying an individual, Mr. Shulaya here, who was — that other individual engaged in far more serious criminal conduct. There's no doubt, Mr. Shulaya has been tried and convicted of some very serious crimes, that Mr. Shulaya was involved in a whole array of criminal behavior. One type of behavior that he was involved in had to do with illegal gambling, and the crime of conviction here for you,

Mr. Makashvili, is some form of involvement with that.

Now, your guidelines are very low because your level and the nature and the type of involvement is far less than it is for others. So I take into account the fact that what the

crime of conviction is here, it's a serious crime, but it's not nearly as egregious in terms of the type of crime, the nature of the crime, the nature of the conduct, as others who are involved somehow in some way with the Shulaya enterprise.

Nevertheless, every individual who is involved with the enterprise, including yourself, was facilitating it in some way. It's important not to overstate an individual's contribution to that facilitation and to keep in mind what they were and what they were not doing, and I do that for you here.

I do acknowledge that you are a first-time offender, a nonviolent offender, that you were not a leader. All of those things are already taken into account with the guidelines. One issue that I have currently with what probation has been doing very recently is probation has been, on the one hand, exercising discretion in their recommendations, which I applaud; on the other hand, they have been doing it in a manner that I think needs to be adjusted. They have been justifying variances, as they did here, that are based upon the very same factors that are already embedded into the guidelines. So in other words, here, nonviolent offender, that's already considered in the guidelines. Type of conduct, already considered in the guidelines.

What would be more helpful to the Court would be how and why, understanding all of those things and having a

guidelines range suggestive of a particular possible sentence or different ways in which a sentence could be structured, why a defendant should, nonetheless, get a variance. There is a possibility with the guidelines of there being zero, and so it's not actually so much of a variance as suggestive that this defendant fits at the very lowest end of that. But I don't have much to go on from what probation said other than what's already embedded in the guidelines.

At the end of the day, it's neither here nor there, ultimately, because I always reference what probation has done. I think about it, but I decide myself what should be done. I am most concerned here with Mr. Makashvili's, what I would call, involvement in the vicinity of illegal activity in ways that are not perhaps totally understood, but he has been involving himself over time with Mr. Shulaya. It was intermittent, Mr. Donaldson, as you have said, but that itself is concerning because it suggests that he was involved, he stopped, he went back to it when he came back after his foreign travel. So it was intermittent but demonstrating a willingness to go back to it.

It is hard for the Court to believe, and indeed I do not believe, that anybody could have been a driver for Mr. Shulaya and not understood that there was a whole host of illegal activity happening because, indeed, it appears that Mr. Shulaya's entire existence was involved in a -- touching a

variety of types of illegal activity, including the gambling. So getting anywhere near it, given the concerns with a career and how a deprivation of liberty could impact Mr. Makashvili's career, how that all could play out, is concerning.

So I have the conduct; then I have an individual who committed the conduct in a way that was knowing; and in terms of what he, Mr. Makashvili, was doing, that was persistent over at least some period of time and was supportive and, ultimately, facilitated illegal conduct.

So that brings me to who he is. And I do acknowledge that he is an individual who makes his living through athletic endeavors, and there's a limited shelf life, as Mr. Donaldson has said; that he is a family man, and that's reflected in the PSR; and that there are many, many individuals who have far less going for them than Mr. Makashvili.

However, I am concerned. I'm very concerned by what occurred in August of 2018 after Mr. Makashvili was able to obtain what is an extraordinarily favorable plea agreement that caps his potential exposure in the way it does and has a guidelines level as low as it is to have been involved again in the vicinity of some form of unlawful activity, which is obtaining a plate from who knows where, but it's a Florida plate, putting it on a vehicle. This is the kind of thing that really concerns me. There are a number of inferences that could be drawn from it, but what I am concerned with is that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Makashvili has not until now fully taken on board the serious consequences that flow from engagement in unlawful behavior and that there is a need for some sentence, albeit a limited sentence, that will serve the purpose of personal deterrence.

As you folks know, what the Court does is it tries to determine for every sentence whether any personal deterrent effect is needed, personal deterrence, general deterrence; what kind of sentence will promote respect for the law; what kind of sentence will be a just sentence; whether there are any educational, vocational, correctional, or other treatment that is suggested by a particular sentence; and, of course, taking into account any mitigating factors. So it is my view that the most recent series of events that occurred in August of 2018 demonstrate a need for personal deterrence, and it is for that reason that the sentence that I will impose today will be a sentence that both acknowledges the seriousness of the crime, the duration of the conduct, the fact that it was returned to intermittently but demonstrating a willingness and desire to return into that universe, and will be therefore a just sentence reflecting all of the necessary sentencing purposes.

So under all of the factors of 3553(a), it is my determination that the defendant should be sentenced to a period of incarceration of six months. I will allow him to self-surrender. So we'll talk about that in a moment.

In addition to that, he will be on supervised release for a period of three years. That period of supervised release will allow probation to monitor the defendant, his movements here in the United States, should he be allowed to remain in the United States, and to ensure that he both seeks full-time employment and otherwise stays on the right side of the law.

There will be certain terms and conditions associated with the period of supervised release, which I'll go through right now. There will be some standard conditions and there will be the following mandatory conditions:

You shall cooperate in the collection of DNA.

You shall not possess a firearm or other destructive device.

You shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime.

You shall not illegally possess a controlled substance, and you shall be tested randomly at least two times to determine whether or not you are using a controlled substance. If you are, then you shall be tested more frequently thereafter.

You shall submit your person, residence, place of business, vehicle, and any premises otherwise under your control or in which you are living to reasonable searches as reasonably requested by probation.

You are to seek and maintain full-time employment

T80HMakS should you have a visa status that allows you to do so. 1 2 You shall obey all immigration laws and directives of the U.S. immigration authorities. 3 4 You shall report to the nearest probation office 5 within 72 hours of your release from custody. 6 And you shall be supervised in your district of 7 residence. 8 There will be a \$100 mandatory special assessment which I impose and do impose. 9 10 I don't find that you have sufficient resources to pay 11 a fine, and so I am not going to impose a fine. And there's no provision for forfeiture or restitution 12 13 here, so those are not imposed. 14 not be imposed as stated? 15

Is there any legal or other reason why sentence should

MR. THOMAS: Not to the government's knowledge, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Donaldson?

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DONALDSON: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: The Court does impose sentence as stated. I'll get to the other applications in just a moment, but let me make sure I sort of close this out.

Are there any open counts?

MR. THOMAS: There's an underlying indictment. government moves to dismiss it.

THE COURT: The Court does dismiss the underlying indictment.

Now, during your plea, Mr. Makashvili, you gave up a number of appeal rights, but it's not the Court's place to tell you whether or not you have any appeal rights. It is my duty to tell you that should you want to file an appeal, you must file any notice of appeal within 14 days of the filing of the judgment of conviction. If you cannot afford the cost of appeal, you can apply to have those costs waived. That's called proceeding in forma pauperis, and you have a right to apply to proceed in that manner.

Now, I did say that I will allow the defendant to self-surrender. I say that with some concern because I think there is a possibility of flight given that, previous to today, he was not aware and perhaps not even counting on any kind of incarceratory sentence, and so his incentives for flight may be altered at this point in time. But at this point I don't sua sponte, unless the government has an application, feel the need to do anything differently.

Let me ask the government, do you have any view that the defendant should not be allowed to self-surrender?

MR. THOMAS: No, your Honor. The government's fine with probation's recommendation.

THE COURT: So we will allow the defendant to self-surrender. What I typically do is I usually,

Mr. Donaldson, allow self-surrender for a period anywhere up to six weeks. We can do the maximum time, which would be six weeks from now, or we can do something sooner to get the sentence underway. What would you prefer?

MR. DONALDSON: I would prefer six weeks, your Honor.

October 5, 2018. The defendant shall surrender to the custody of the U.S. marshals here in this building if a facility has not already been designated for him. Because of the shortness of the sentence, it may be that the defendant will remain in the New York City area and/or over at one of the facilities nearby, so he may not be designated any place. But in all events, by October 5, 2018 -- did I say 11 a.m.?

MR. DONALDSON: You did not.

THE COURT: At 11 a.m. he should surrender to the marshals in this building or to his facility.

Now, are there any other applications? Mr. Donaldson, I think you had something.

MR. DONALDSON: No, I did not, your Honor. I was going to talk about the voluntary surrender. I presume there is no conceivable way at this point I can convince the Court to reconsider that six months and go to three months?

THE COURT: I believe that six months is a sufficient, but not greater than necessary, sentence for this defendant given the series of events to adequately ensure personal

deterrence, and that is the primary reason for my coming up with an incarceratory sentence and a sentence of that duration. So I guess the answer is no. All right. If there's nothing further, then we are adjourned. Thank you. (Adjourned)